

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 10, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 14-17 and 19-28 were rejected under 35 USC 103, on the basis of the previously-cited Inoue et al patent in view of the newly-cited Fukushima et al patent. Claims 2, 7, 13 and 18 were rejected on the basis of these two patents, in further view of the Bar et al patent. For the reasons presented hereinafter, it is respectfully submitted that the references do not disclose the claimed subject matter, whether considered individually or in combination.

Claim 1 recites a controller that analyzes image data to determine a scene thereof, and corrects the image data with a first type of correction parameter. The claim further recites an instruction device by which a user enters an instruction to enter an alternative type of correction parameter. When the user enters such an instruction, the controller corrects the image data with the alternative type of correction parameter. For instance, as depicted in Figure 6 of the application, the controller has determined that the image data represents a scene with weak color fog, and displays a correction parameter that corresponds to this determination ("CORRECT WEAKLY"). The screen also displays alternative types of correction parameters ("NO CORRECTION" and "CORRECT STRONGLY"). If the user enters an instruction to utilize one of these alternative types of parameters, the image data is corrected in accordance therewith.

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action states that the Inoue patent discloses a first correction parameter, with reference to the correction patterns 601 illustrated in Figure 6. The Action also states that the patent discloses a second correction parameter, with reference to the correction amount specifying means 602. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the correction amount that can be adjusted by this specifying means is not an alternative *type* of correction parameter. Rather, it is a specific value for the correction pattern selected from the list 601. In other words, the selected pattern from the list 601 and the correction amount that is set by the specifying means 602 relate to the *same* type of correction parameter. They are not alternative (or different) types of correction parameters, as set forth in claims 1, 10, 12 and 21.

Claims 10, 12 and 21 recite that the scene determined from the analysis and a first type of correction parameter are displayed. The Office Action asserts that this subject matter is described in the Inoue patent at column 10, lines 1-8, and Figure 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Inoue patent discloses that the correction patterns and the correction amount are preliminarily displayed for selection by the user. They are not based on the result of analysis, as recited in the claims.

The Office Action suggests that it would be obvious to automatically detect the scenes to be corrected, in view of the Fukushima patent, rather than have the user manually designate the scene. Even with such a modification, however, the claimed feature does not result. Neither reference discloses, or otherwise suggests, displaying both a determined scene and a correction parameter that result from an analysis of the image data. Consequently, any possible combination of their teachings does not render this feature obvious.

Furthermore, if the noted teachings of the Fukushima patent were to be applied to the system of the Inoue patent, it would eliminate the need for manual scene determination. As such, there would be no reason to display the correction pattern specifying means 601, since this is the mechanism via which the user manually designates the correction pattern. It is respectfully submitted that such a modification would still not lead one to the claimed subject matter. It would not result in displaying the scene of the image data and a first type of correction parameter that corresponds to the determined scene, setting an alternative type correction parameter in the screen of the display device by a user, and correcting the image data with the first type of correction parameter obtained by the analysis or with the alternative type of correction parameter when the user sets the second type of correction parameter.


The Office Action characterizes claims 5 and 16 as the corresponding image processor and computer readable storage medium to claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that this is an improper interpretation of the claims. As recited in these claims, as well as claim 11, the display device displays, in a screen, the scene of the image data that is determined from an analysis of the image data. For the reasons presented previously, it is respectfully submitted that the Inoue and Fukushima patents do not disclose this claimed

feature of the invention. Furthermore, the Bar patent does not contain any disclosure that overcomes this distinction.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the pending claims is not disclosed, nor otherwise suggested, by the Inoue, Fukushima and Bar patents, whether they are considered individually or in combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: August 10, 2005

By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620